arXiv:1407.5198v5 [math.FA] 23 Jan 2015

Complete Rank Theorem in Advanced Calculus and Frobenius Theorem in Banach Space

Ma Jipu[1,2]

Abstract The application of generalized inverses is usually neglected in pure mathematical research. However, it is very effective for this paper. The famous matrix rank theorem was established by R. Penrose in 1955. We expand the theorem from the case of matrices to that of operators. Then a modern perturbation analysis of generalized inverses is built. Hereby, we find and prove a complete rank theorem in advanced calculus. So a complete answer to the rank theorem problem presented by M. S. Berger is given. Let Λ be an open set in a Banach space E and x_0 be a point in Λ. We consider the family of subspaces $\mathcal{F}= \{M(x)\}_{x\in\Lambda}$, especially, where the dimension of $M(x)$ may be infinity, and investigate the necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{F}$ being c^1 integrable at x_0. For this we introduce the concept of the co-final set $J(x_0, E_*)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ at x_0. Then applying the co-final set and the perturbation analysis of generalized inverses we prove the Frobenius theorem in Banach space in the proof of which the used vector field and flow theory are avoided. The co-final set is essential to the Frobenius theorem. When $J(x_0, E_*)$ is trivial, the theorem reduces to an initial value problem for a differential equation in Banach space. Let $B(E, F)$ be the set of all bounded linear operators from E into another Banach space F, $\Lambda = B(E, F) \setminus \{0\}$ and $M(X) = \{T \in B(E, F) : TN(X) \subset R(X)\}$ for any $X \in \Lambda$. In 1989, V. Cafagna introduced a geometrical method for some partial differential equations and the family of subspaces $\mathcal{F} = \{M(X)\}_{x\in\Lambda}$. Let $\Phi_{1,1}$ be the set of all Fredholm operators T with $\dim N(T) = \mathrm{codim} R(T) = 1$. It is essential to this method that $\Phi_{1,1}$ is a smooth submanifold in $B(E, F)$ and tangent to $M(X)$ at any $X \in \Phi_{1,1}$. The co-final set of the family $\mathcal{F}$ at $A \in \Lambda$ is nontrivial in general. Applying the perturbation analysis of generalized inverses, the above property for $\Phi_{1,1}$ is expanded to wider classes of operators $\Phi_{m,n}$, semi-Fredholm operators $\Phi_{m,\infty}$ and $\Phi_{\infty,n}$. It seems to be useful for further developing the method introduced by V. Cafagna.

Key words Rank Theorem, Locally Fine Point, Frobenius Theorem, Co-final Set, Smooth submanifold.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification 46T99, 37C05, 53C40

0 Introduction

Let E, F be two Banach spaces, U an open set in E and f a nonlinear c^1 map from U into F. Recall that f is said to be locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ (Fréchet derivative of f at x_0) near $x_0 \in U$ provided there exist a neighborhood $U_0(\subset U)$ at x_0, a neighborhood $V_0(\subset F)$ at 0, and diffeomorphisms $\varphi : U_0 \to \varphi(U_0)$ with $\varphi(x_0) = 0$, $\varphi'(x_0) = I_E$ and $\psi : V_0 \to \psi(V_0)$ with $\psi(0) = y_0(= f(x_0))$, $\psi'(0) = I_F$, such that

$$f(x) = (\psi \circ f'(x_0) \circ \varphi)(x), \qquad \forall x \in U_0, \tag{$*$}$$

where I_E and I_F denote the identities on E and F, respectively.

It is well known that if one of the following conditions holds: $N(f'(x_0)) = \{0\}$ and $R(f'(x_0))$ splits in $F; R(f'(x_0)) = F$, $N(f'(x_0))$ splits in E; and $\text{rank} f'(x) = \text{rank} f'(x_0) < \infty$ near x_0, then f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ near x_0. These are important basic theorems in non-linear functional analysis (for details, see [Zie] and [Abr]). By saying the rank theorem problem one means what property of f (more general than the three conditions above) ensures the equality $(*)$ holds. In [Beg], M. S. Berger points out that it is not yet known whether the rank theorem in advanced calculus holds even if f is a Fredholm map. It is not difficult to observe that each of the three conditions above ensures that $f'(x)$ near x_0 has a generalized inverse $f'(x)^+$ (See Section 1) satisfying

$$\lim_{x \to x_0} f'(x)^+ = f'(x_0)^+. \tag{$**$}$$

So we have in mind to seek the condition for which the equality $(**)$ holds, and try to find the answer to the rank theorem problem.

Let X be a topological space, and $B(E, F)$ be the set of all bounded linear operators from E into F. Suppose that the operator valued map $T_x : X \mapsto B(E, F)$ is continuous at $x_0 \in X$, and T_{x_0} is double splitting. In Section 1, we will introduce the concept of a locally fine point of T_x and prove the following operator rank theorem: for any generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_{x_0}, there exists a neighborhood U_0 at x_0 such that T_x for any $x \in U_0$ has a generalized inverse T_x^+ and $T_x^+ \to T_0^+$ as $x \to x_0$ if and only if x_0 is a locally fine point of T_x. Now it is obvious that the equality $(**)$ holds if and only if x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$. As expected, the following complete rank theorem in advanced calculus will be proved in this section: f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$, i.e., the equality $(*)$ holds, if and only if x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$. By Theorem 1.9, one observes that the complete rank theorem in advanced calculus expands widely the three results known well. Therefore the rank theorem problem presented by M. S. Berger has a complete answer. Theorems 1.10 and 1.11 are essential to the form of Frobenius theorem in Banach space and smooth differential structure for some smooth submanifolds, respectively. In Section 2, we consider the family of subspaces in E as, $\mathcal{F} = \{M(x) : x \in \Lambda\}$, where Λ is an open set in E, and $M(x)$ is a subspace in E, especially, where the dimension of $M(x)$ may be infinity. Recall that $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be c^1

integrable at x_0 provided there exist a neighborhood U_0 at x_0 and a c^1-submanifold S in U_0, such that $x_0 \in S$ and

$$M(x) = \{\dot{c}(0) : \quad \text{for all} \quad c^1-\text{curve } c(t) \subset S \text{ with } c(0) = x\},$$

$\forall x \in S$, i.e., S is tangent to $M(x)$ at $x \in S$. We introduce the co-final set $J(x_0, E_*)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ at $x_0 \in \Lambda$ and prove if $\mathcal{F}$ is c^1 integrable at x_0, say that S is the c^1 integral submanifold in E, then there exists a neighborhood U_0 at x_0, such that $J(x_0, E_*) \supset S \cap U_0$. Moreover, we have the coordinate expression of $M(x)$ as, $M(x) = \{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in M_0\}$ for all $x \in J(x_0, E_*)$, where $M_0 = M(x_0)$ and $\alpha \in B(M_0, E_*)$. Therefore we obtain the necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{F}$ being c^1 integrable at x_0, i.e., the Frobenius theorem in Banach space. Thanks to the co-final set $J(x_0, E_*)$, the used vector field and flow theory are avoided in the proof of the theorem. The co-final set is essential to the theorem. When $J(x_0, E_*)$ is trivial, the theorem reduces to an initial value problem for a differential equation in Banach space. Let $\Lambda = B(E, F) \setminus \{0\}$ and $M(X) = \{T \in B(E, F) : TN(X) \subset R(X)\}$ for any $X \in \Lambda$. In section 3, we investigate the family of subspaces $\mathcal{F} = \{M(X)\}_{X \in \Lambda}$. In fact, V. Cafagna introduces the geometrical method for some partial differential equations in [Caf], and presents the following property: let $\Phi_{1,1}$ be the set of all Fredholm operators T with $\dim N(T) = \text{co-dim} R(T) = 1$, then $\Phi_{1,1}$ is a smooth submanifold in $B(E, F)$ and tangent to $M(X)$ at any $X \in \Phi_{1,1}$, which is the key point to the method. The co-final set of $\mathcal{F}$ at the double splitting $A \in \Lambda$, in general, is non-trivial. In this case,in order to get the integral submanifold S of $\mathcal{F}$ at A, we try its co-final set. Let $\Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}(\Phi_{\infty,n})$ and F_k denote the sets of all Fredholm operators T with $\dim N(T) = m$ and co-$\dim R(T) = n$, of semi-Fredhlom operators T with $\dim N(T) = m$ and co-$\dim R(T) = \infty$($\dim N(T) = \infty$ and co-$\dim R(T) = n$), and of operators T with $\text{rank} T = k < \infty$, respectively. Applying the modern perturbation analysis of generalized inverses we prove the following results: suppose that Φ is any one of $\Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}(\Phi_{\infty,n})$ and F_k , then Φ is a smooth submanifold in $B(F, E)$, and tangent to $M(X)$ at any $X \in \Phi$. Obviously, these results expand the property for $\Phi_{1,1}$ proposed by V. Cafagna to wider classes of operators. It seems to be useful for further developing this method (see [An]).

1 Complete Rank Theorem and Modern Perturbation Analysis of Generalized Inverses

Recall that $A^+ \in B(F, E)$ is said to be a generalized inverse of $A \in B(E, F)$ provided $A^+AA^+ = A^+$ and $A = AA^+A$, (when both E and F are Hilbert spaces, A^+ is said to be M. -P. inverse of A provided $(AA^+)^* = AA^+$ and $(A^+A)^* = A^+A$, and it is unique); $A \in B(E, F)$ is said to be double splitting if $R(A)$ is closed, and there exist closed subspaces R^+ in E and N^+ in F such that $E = N(A) \oplus R^+$ and $F = R(A) \oplus N^+$, respectively. It is well known that A has a generalized inverse $A^+ \in B(F, E)$ if and only if A is double splitting.

The classical perturbation analysis of the generalized inverse is marked with the matrix rank theorem by R. Penrose. Let A and ΔA belong to $B(\mathbf{R}^n)$, and both A^+ and $(A+\Delta A)^+$ be M. -P. inverses of A and $(A+\Delta A)$, respectively. The theorem says that $\lim\limits_{\Delta A\to o}(A+\Delta A)^+ = A^+$ if and only if $\mathrm{rank}(A+\Delta A) = \mathrm{rank}\ A$ for ΔA small enough. The condition in the theorem ensures that the computing of A^+ is stable. Hereafter one will try to expand the theorem to the case of operators in $B(E,F)$. This is very difficult because of no fixed one of generalized inverses like M. -P. inverse for every double splitting operator in $B(E,F)$. Thanks to a study of rank theorem problem proposed by M. S. Berger in [Beg], we find the main concept and theorems in modern perturbation analysis of generalized inverses, and obtain a complete rank theorem. First we will work on perturbation analysis of generalized inverse. Let $A \in B(E,F)$ be double splitting, $A \neq 0$, and A^+ be a generalized inverse of A. Write $V(A,A^+) = \{T \in B(E,F) : \|T-A\| < \|A^+\|^{-1}\}, C_A(A^+,T) = I_F + (T-A)A^+$, and $D_A(A^+,T) = I_E + A^+(T-A)$. Then we have

Theorem 1.1 *The following conditions for $T \in V(A,A^+)$ are equivalent* :

(i) $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$;

(ii) $B = A^+C_A(A^+,T) = D_A(A^+,T)A^+$ *is the generalized inverse of T with* $R(B) = R(A^+)$ *and* $N(B) = N(A^+)$;

(iii) $R(T) \oplus N(A^+) = F$;

(iv) $N(T) \oplus R(A^+) = E$;

(v) $(I_E - A^+A)N(T) = N(A)$;

(vi) $C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)TN(A) \subset R(A)$;

(vii) $R(C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)T) \subset R(A)$.

Proof We are going to show (vi) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii). Note that M. Z. Nashed and X. C. Chen have proved (vi)$\Rightarrow$ (ii) in [N-C]. Indeed, the inverse relation holds too. Obviously, $C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)TA^+A = A$ for all $T \in V(A,A^+)$. Hereby it follows that

$$BTB - B = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad TBT - T = -(I_F - AA^+)C^{-1}(A^+,T)T \tag{1.1}$$

for any $T \in V(A,A^+)$. So(vi)$\Leftrightarrow$(ii).

Evidently,

$$\begin{aligned} C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)Th &= C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)TA^+Ah + C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)T(I_E - A^+A)h \\ &= Ah + C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)T(I_E - A^+A)h, \quad \forall h \in E, \end{aligned}$$

so that (vi)$\Leftrightarrow$(vii).

Go to the claim (v)$\Leftrightarrow$(vi). Assume that (vi) holds. We have for any $h \in N(A)$, there exists $g \in R(A^+)$ such that $C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)Th = Ag$. Note $A^+Ag = g$, then $C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)Th = Ag = C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)TA^+Ag = C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)Tg$. So $h - g \in N(T)$ and

satisfies $(I_E - A^+A)(h-g) = h$. This shows that (v) holds. Conversely, assume that (v) holds. Then we have for any $h \in N(A)$, there exists $g \in N(T)$ such that $h = (I_E - A^+A)g$, and so, $C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)Th = C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)TA^+Ag = Ag \in R(A)$, i.e., (vi) holds. This shows (v)$\Leftrightarrow$ (vi).

Go to the claim (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(ii). Obviously, (ii)$\Rightarrow$(i). Conversely, assume that (i) holds. By (1.1), $BTB - B = 0$ and $R(TBT - T) \subset N(A^+)$. Obviously $R(TBT - T) \subset R(T)$. By the assumption $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$, one concludes that B is the generalized inverse of T, this shows (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii). So (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(ii).

Go to show (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(iii). Obviously, (iii)$\Rightarrow$(i). Conversely, assume that (i) holds. Then B is the generalized inverse of T with $N(B) = N(A^+)$ because of the equivalence of (i) and (ii). So (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(iii).

Finally go to show (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(iv). Assume that (i) holds. Since (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii), one can conclude (iv) holds. Conversely, assume that (iv) holds. Then $N(A) = (I_E - A^+A)E = (I_E - A^+A)N(T)$ i.e., (v) holds. Hence (i) holds since (v) $\Leftrightarrow$(vi)$\Leftrightarrow$(ii)$\Leftrightarrow$(i). This shows (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(iv).

So far we have proved the following relations (i)$\Leftrightarrow$(ii),(i)$\Leftrightarrow$(iii),(i)$\Leftrightarrow$(iv), (ii)$\Leftrightarrow$(vi), (v)$\Leftrightarrow$(vi), and (vi)$\Leftrightarrow$(vii). Thus the proof of the theorem is completed. $\square$

(For more information, see [H-M]).

The condition (i) looks strange; however, it may imply many known conditions in analysis as showing in the next theorem.

Let $F_k = \{T \in B(E,F) : \text{rank}T = k < \infty\}$, and $\Phi_{m,n} = \{T \in B(E,F)$: dim $N(T) = m < \infty$ and codim$R(T) = n < \infty\}$. Let $\Phi_{m,\infty}$ be the set of all semi-Fredholm operators T with dim$N(T) = m$ and codim$R(T) = \infty$, and $\Phi_{\infty,n}$ be the set of all semi-Fredholm operators T with dim$N(T) = \infty$ and codim$R(T) = n$. We have

Theorem 1.2 *Assume that A belongs to any one of $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}$ and $\Phi_{\infty,n}$. Then the condition $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$ for $T \in V(A, A^+)$ holds if and only if T belongs to the corresponding class for A.*

Proof Assume that the condition $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$ holds for $T \in V(A, A^+)$. By (ii) in Theorem 1.1, T has a generalized inverse B with $N(B) = N(A^+)$ and $R(B) = R(A^+)$, so that

$$N(T) \oplus R(A^+) = E = N(A) \oplus R(A^+)$$

and

$$R(T) \oplus N(A^+) = F = R(A) \oplus N(A^+).$$

Hereby one observes that when A belongs to any one of $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}$ and $\Phi_{\infty,n}, T$ belongs to the corresponding class for A.

Conversely, assume that T belong to any one of $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}$ and $\Phi_{\infty,n}$. By (1.1), $B = A^+C_A^{-1}(A^+, T) = D_A^{-1}(A^+, T)A^+$ satisfies $BTB = B$. Thus B and T bear two projections $P_1 = BT$ and $P_2 = TB$. Indeed, $P_1^2 = BTBT = BT = P_1$, and

$P_2^2 = TBTB = TB = P_2$. Note $N(B) = N(A^+)$. Clearly, $N(P_1) = N(T) + \{e \in R(T^+) : Te \in N(A^+)\}$, where by the assumption, T has a generalized inverse T^+. We next claim

$$R(P_1) = R(A^+), R(P_2) = R(TA^+), \quad \text{and} \quad N(P_2) = N(A^+).$$

Obviously, $R(P_1) \subset R(B) = R(A^+)$. On the other hand, by $C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)TA^+ = AA^+$ we get

$$P_1A^+e = A^+C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)TA^+e = A^+AA^+e = A^+e, \quad \forall e \in E.$$

So $R(P_1) = R(A^+)$.

Obviously,

$$R(P_2) = R(TA^+C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)) = R(TA^+).$$
$$N(P_2) = N(TD_A^{-1}(A^+, T)A^+) \supset N(A^+),$$

and

$$Be = BTBe = BP_2e = 0, \quad \forall c \in N(P_2).$$

So, $N(P_2) = N(A^+)$ because of $B = D_A^{-1}(A^+, T)A^{-1}$.

Thus we have

$$F = R(P_2) \oplus N(P_2) = R(TA^+) \oplus N(A^+) \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$E = R(P_1) \oplus N(P_1) = R(A^+) \oplus E_* \oplus N(T),$$

where $E_* = \{e \in R(T^+) : Te \in N(A^+)\}$.

We now are in the position to end the proof.

Assume that $T \in V(A, A^+)$ satisfies rank$T$ =rank$A < \infty$. Obviously T is double splitting. Let T^+ be an arbitrary generalized inverse of T, then $E = N(T) \oplus R(T^+)$. Note dim$R(T^+)$ =rank$T$ =rank$A$ = dim$R(A^+) < \infty$. According to (1.2) dim$E_* = 0$, i.e., $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$.

Assume that $T \in V(A, A^+)$ satisfies codim$R(T)$ = codim$R(A) = n < \infty$, and $N(T)$ is splitting in E. Obviously, T is double splitting. Let T^+ be an arbitrary generalized inverse of T, then $F = R(T) \oplus N(T^+)$. According to (1.2)

$$R(TA^+) \oplus TE_* \oplus N(T^+) = F = R(TA^+) \oplus N(A^+).$$

Since dim$N(A^+)$ = codim$R(A)$ = codim$R(T)$ = dim$N(T^+) = n < \infty$, one observes dim$TE_* = 0$. Note that $E_* \subset R(T^+)$ and $T|_{R(T^+)}$ is invertible in $B(R(T^+), R(T))$, then we conclude dim$E_* = 0$, i.e., $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$.

Assume that $T \in V(A, A^+)$ satisfies dim$N(T)$ = dim$N(A) = m < \infty$, and $R(T)$ is splitting in F. Obviously, T is double splitting. According to (1.2), we have

$$R(A^+) \oplus E_* \oplus N(T) = R(A^+) \oplus N(A).$$

Hereby it is easy to observe $\dim E_* = 0$, i.e., $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$. So far one can conclude that both T in $V(A, A^+)$ and A belong to the same one of $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{\infty,n}$ and $\Phi_{m,\infty}$, then $R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}$. $\square$

Let $A^\oplus$ be another generalized inverse of A, $B = A^+AA^\oplus$, and $\delta = \min\{\|A^+\|^{-1}, \|B\|^{-1}\}$. Moreover, we have

Theorem 1.3 *Let $S = \{T \in V(A, A^+) : R(T) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\})$, and $V_\delta = \{T \in B(E, F) : \|T - A\| < \delta\}$. Then*

$$R(T) \cap N(A^\oplus) = \{0\}, \quad \forall T \in S \cap V_\delta.$$

Proof It is easy to see that B is the generalized inverse of A with $R(B) = R(A^+)$ and $N(B) = N(A^\oplus)$. By the conditions (i) and (iv) in Theorem 1.1, $E = N(T) \oplus R(A^+)$, i.e., $E = N(T) \oplus R(B)$ for all $T \in S$. Instead of A^+ in Theorem 1.1 by B, one observes that $E = N(T) \oplus R(B)$ is equivalent to $R(T) \cap N(B) = \{0\}$ for $T \in V(A, B)$. So $R(T) \cap N(A^\oplus) = \{0\}$ for $T \in S \cap V_\delta$. $\square$

We now are in the position to discuss modern perturbation analysis of generalized inverses. Consider the operator valued map T_x from a topological space X into $B(E, F)$.

Definition 1.1 *Suppose that T_x is continuous at $x_0 \in X$, and that $T_0 \equiv T_{x_0}$ is double splitting. x_0 is said to be a locally fine point of T_x provided there exist a generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0 and a neighborhood U_0 (dependent on T_0^+) at x_0, such that*

$$R(T_x) \cap N(T_0^+) = \{0\}, \qquad \forall x \in U_0. \tag{1.3}$$

For the locally fine point, we have the following important theorem.

Theorem 1.4 *The definition of the locally fine point x_0 of T_x is independent of the choice of the generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0.*

Proof Assume that (1.3) holds for a generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0 and a neighborhood U_0 at x_0. Let $T_0^\oplus$ be another generalized inverse of $T_0, \delta = \min\{\|T_0^+\|^{-1}, \|T_0^+ T_0 T_0^\oplus\|^{-1}\}$, and $V_\delta = \{T \in B(E, F) : \|T - T_0\| < \delta\}$. Set $V_0 = \{x \in U_0 : T_x \in V_\delta\}$. Then by Theorem 1.3, $R(T_x) \cap N(T_0^\oplus) = \{0\}$ for all $x \in V_0$. $\square$

The following theorem expands the famous matrix rank theorem by R. Penrose to operators in $B(E, F)$.

Theorem 1.5 (Operator rank theorem) *Suppose that the operator valued map $T_x : X \to B(E, F)$ is continuous at $x_0 \in X$ and T_0 is double splitting. Then the following conclusion holds for arbitrary generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0: there exists a neighborhood U_0 at x_0 such that T_x has a generalized inverse T_x^+ for $x \in U_0$, and $\lim_{x \to x_0} T_x^+ = T_0$, if and only if x_0 is a locally fine point of T_x.*

Proof Assume that x_0 is a locally fine point of T_x. Let $U_0 = \{x \in X : \|T_x - T_0^+\| < \|T_0^+\|^{-1}\}$ for an arbitrary generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0, and $T_x^+ = T_0^+ C_{T_0}^{-1}(T_0^+, T_x)$ for

every $x \in U_0$. Since T_x is continuous at $x_0 \in X$, one observes that U_0 is a neighborhood at x_0. However, it is easy to see that T_x^+ is the generalized inverse of T_x for any $x \in U_0$ such that $\lim_{x \to x_0} T_x^+ = T_0^+$. Conversely, assume that the following conclusion holds for some generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0: there exists a neighborhood U_0 at x_0 such that T_x has a generalized inverse $T_x^+, \forall x \in U_0$, and $\lim_{x \to x_0} T_x^+ = T_0^+$. Consider the projections, $P_x = I_E - T_x^+ T_x$ and $P_0 = I_E - T_0^+ T_0$. Obviously, $R(P_x) = N(T_x)$, $R(P_0) = N(T_0)$, and $P_x \to P_0$ as $x \to x_0$. Let $V_0 = \{x \in U_0 : \|P_x - P_0\} < 1\} \cap \{x \in U_0 : \|T_x - T_0\| < \|T_0^+\|^{-1}\}$. Then by Problem 4.1 in [Ka], $P_0 N(T_x) = N(T_0)$, i.e., the condition (v) in Theorem 1.1 holds for all $x \in V_0$. Thus, by the equivalence of (v) and (i) in Theorem 1.1, we conclude $R(T_x) \cap N(T_0^+) = \{0\}, \forall x \in V_0$. Finally, by Theorem 1.4 we conclude that x_0 is a locally fine point of T_x. $\square$

We now are going to investigate the operator rank theorem in Hilbert spaces like the matrix rank theorem by R. Penrose. Before working on this, we introduce the following lemma, which is very useful in the operator theory in Hilbert space, although it is simple.

Lemma 1.1 *Suppose that H is a Hilbert space, and E_1 is a closed subspace in H. Let $H = E_1 \oplus E_2$ while the relation $E_1 \perp E_2$ is not assumed, and $P_{E_1}^{E_2}$ be the projection corresponding to the decomposition $H = E_1 \oplus E_2$. Then*

$$(P_{E_1}^{E_2})^* = P_{E_2^\perp}^{E_1^\perp},$$

where $E_1^\perp$ and $E_2^\perp$ denote the orthogonal complements of E_1 and E_2, respectively.

Proof For abbreviation, write $P = P_{E_1}^{E_2}$. It is clear that P^* is also a projection since $(P^*)^2 = (P^2)^* = P^*$. So in order to show the lemma, it is enough to examine $R(P^*) = E_2^\perp$ and $N(P^*) = E_1^\perp$. Obviously

$$H = N(P) \oplus R(P^*) = E_2 \oplus R(P^*),$$

and

$$H = R(P) \oplus N(P^*) = E_1 \oplus N(P^*),$$

where $\oplus$ denotes the orthogonal direct sum. Then the lemma follows. $\square$

With Lemma 1.1 we can establish the operator rank theorem in Hilbert spaces as follows.

Theorem 1.6 *Let H_1, H_2 be Hilbert spaces, and T_x an operator valued map from a topological space X into $B(H_1, H_2)$. Suppose that T_x is continuous at $x_0 \in X$ and $R(T_0)$ is closed . Then the following conclusion holds: for M.-P. inverse T_0^+ of T_0 there exists a neighborhood U_0 at x_0 such that T_x has M.-P. inverse T_x^+ (i.e., $R(T_x)$ is closed) for $x \in U_0$ and $\lim_{x \to x_0} T_x^+ = T_0^+$, if and only if x_0 is a locally fine point of T_x.*

Proof Assume that the conclusion of the theorem holds for M. -P. inverse T_0^+ of T_0. By Theorem 1.5 it is immediate that x_0 is a locally fine point of T_x. Conversely, assume

that x_0 is a locally fine point of Tx. By Definition 1.1 there exists a neighborhood U_0 at x_0, such that $R(T_x) \cap N(T_0^+) = \{0\}$ for $x \in U_0$. Without loss of generality one can assume $\|T_x - T_0\| < \|T_0^+\|^{-1}$ for all $x \in U_0$ since T_x is continuous at x_0. Thus, $B_x = T_0^+ C_{T_0}^{-1}(T_0^+, T_x)$ is the generalized inverse of T_x with $R(B_x) = R(T_0^+)$ and $N(B_x) = N(T_0^+)$ for all $x \in U_0$ because of the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.1 and so, $R(T_x)$ is closed. Let T_x^+ be M. -P. inverse of T_x. Our goal is to verify $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} T_x^+ = T_0^+$. Before working on this we claim that $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} T_x^+ T_x = T_0^+ T_0$ and $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} T_x T_x^+ = T_0 T_0^+$. By Lemma 1.1 it is clear

$$(I_{H_1} - T_x^* B_x^*) = P_{N(T_0)}^{R(T_x^*)}, \qquad \forall x \in U_0. \tag{1.4}$$

In fact, $B_x T_x = P_{R(T_0^+)}^{N(T_x)}$ and so $(I_{H_1} - T_x^* B_x^*) = (I_{H_1} - (B_x T_x)^*) = (I_{H_1} - P_{R(T_x^*)}^{N(T_0)}) = P_{N(T_0)}^{R(T_x^*)}$, then the equality (1.4) follows from Lemma1.1.

First go to show $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} T_x^+ T_x = T_0^+ T_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_x^+ T_x - T_0^+ T_0\| &\leq \|T_x^+ T_x (I_{H_1} - T_0^+ T_0)\| + \|(I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_0^+ T_0\| \\
&= \|((I_{H_1} - T_0^+ T_0) T_x^+ T_x)^*\| + \|(I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_0^+ T_0\| \\
&= \|(I_{H_1} - T_0^+ T_0) T_x^+ T_x\| + \|(I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_0^+ T_0\|
\end{aligned}$$

(Note that $(T_x^+ T_x)^* = T_x^+ T_x$ and $(T_0^+ T_0)^* = T_0^+ T_0$ since both T_x^+ and T_0^+ are M.-P. inverse), while, by (1.4) and $R(T_x^+) = R(T_x^*)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(I_{H_1} - T_0^+ T_0) T_x^+ T_x\| &= \|T_x^+ T_x - (I_{H_1} - T_x^* B_x^*) T_x^+ T_x - T_0^+ T_0 T_x^+ T_x\| \\
&= \|(I_{H_1} - T_0^+ T_0) T_x^+ T_x - (I_{H_1} - T_x^* B_x^*) T_x^+ T_x\| \\
&\leq \|(I_{H_1} - T_0^+ T_0) - (I_H - T_x^* B_x^*)\| = \|T_x^* B_x^* - T_0^+ T_0\|
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_0^+ T_0\| &= \|T_0^+ T_0 - (I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_x^* B_x^* - T_x^+ T_x T_0^+ T_0\| \\
&= \|(I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_0^+ T_0 - (I_{H_1} - T_x^+ T_x) T_x^* B_x^*\| \\
&\leq \|T_0^+ T_0 - T_x^* B_x^*\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $T_x^* B_x^* \to T_0^* T_0^{+*} = (T_0^+ T_0)^* = T_0^+ T_0$ as $x \to x_0$, one can conclude $\lim\limits_{x\to x_0} T_x^+ T_x = T_0^+ T_0$.

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_x T_x^+ - T_0 T_0^+\| &= \|(I_{H_2} - T_0 T_0^+) T_x T_x^+ - T_0 T_0^+ (I_{H_2} - T_x T_x^+)\| \\
&\leq \|(I_{H_2} - T_0 T_0^+) T_x T_x^+\| + \|((I_{H_2} - T_x T_x^+) T_0 T_0^+)^*\| \\
&= \|(I_{H_2} - T_0 T_0^+) T_x T_x^+\| + \|(I_{H_2} - T_x T_x^+) T_0 T_0^+\|,
\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}\|(I_{H_2} - T_0T_0^+)T_xT_x^+\| &= \|(I_{H_2} - T_0T_0^+)T_xT_x^+ - (I_{H_2} - T_xB_x)T_xT_x^+\| \\ &= \|(T_xB_x - T_0T_0^+)T_xT_x^+\| \leq \|T_xB_x - T_0T_0^+\|\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|(I_{H_2} - T_xT_x^+)T_0T_0^+\| &= \|(I_{H_2} - T_xT_x^+)T_0T_0^+ - (I_{H_2} - T_xT_x^+)T_xB_x\| \\ &\leq \|T_0T_0^+ - T_xB_x\|.\end{aligned}$$

.

Then it follows $\lim_{x\to x_0} T_xT_x^+ = T_0T_0^+$ from $T_xB_x \to T_0T_0^+$ as $x \to x_0$.

Finally, go to end the proof. Let $G_x = T_x^+T_xB_x$ and $Q_x = B_xT_xT_x^+$. By direct computing

$$G_xT_xQ_x = T_x^+T_xB_xT_xB_xT_xT_x^+ = T_x^+T_xB_xT_xT_x^+ = T_x^+T_x^+ = T_x^+,$$

meanwhile, by the two results proved above, one observes

$$\lim_{x\to x_0} G_x = T_0^+ = \lim_{x\to x_0} Q_x.$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{x\to x_0} T_x^+ = \lim_{x\to x_0} G_xT_xQ_x = T_0^+T_0T_0^+ = T_0^+.$$

The proof ends. □

This theorem is presented in the dissertation of Q. L. Huang, a post graduate student of mine; see also [H-M]. Here the complete proof of the theorem is given.

So far, a modern perturbation analysis of generalized inverses is built.

We now are in the position to establish the rank theorem in advanced calculus. Let f be a c^1 map, defined in an open set $U \subset E$ into F, and $f'(x_0), x_0 \in U$, be double splitting. By saying the rank theorem problem we mean that the property of f can ensure the following conclusion holds: there exist neighborhoods $U_0 \subset U$ at $x_0, V_0 \subset F$ at 0, diffeomorphisms φ from U_0 onto $\varphi(U_0)$ and ψ from V_0 onto $\psi(V_0)$ such that $\varphi(x_0) = 0, \varphi'(x_0) = I_E, \psi(0) = f(x_0), \psi'(0) = I$, and

$$f(x) = (\psi \circ f'(x_0) \circ \varphi)(x), \qquad \forall x \in U_0,$$

i.e., f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ near x_0. (For details see [Beg]). Since a locally fine point x_0 of $f'(x)$ is equivalent to $(I_E - T_0^+T_0)N(f'(x)) = N(f'(x_0))$ near x_0(where T_0^+ is a generalized inverse of $f'(x_0)$), we have proved indeed the following rank theorem in [Ma.1] in 1999's. However, there are many typing mistakes in the argument of the theorem, one can hardly read. After some modifications we rewrite the theorem as follows.

Theorem 1.7 *Let f be a c^1 map, defined in an open set $U \subset E$ into F, and $f'(x_0)$ its Fréchet derivative at $x_0 \in U$. Suppose that $f'(x_0)$ is double splitting. If x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$, then there exist neighborhoods U_0 at x_0, V_0 at 0, diffeomorphisms $\varphi : U_0 \to \varphi(U_0)$ and $\psi : V_0 \to \psi(V_0$ such that $\varphi(x_0) = 0, \varphi'(x_0) = I_E, \psi(0) = f(x_0), \psi'(0) = I_F$ and*

$$f(x) = (\psi \circ f'(x)0) \circ \varphi)(x), \qquad \forall x \in U_0.$$

Proof It is the key point to the proof of the theorem to determine the diffeomorphisms φ and ψ. Let T_0^+ be a generalized inverse of $T_0 = f'(x_0)$. Set

$$\varphi(x) = T_0^+(f(x) - f(x_0)) + (I_E - T_0^+T_0)(x - x_0)$$

and

$$\psi(y) = (f \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ T_0^+)(y) + (I_F - T_0T_0^+)y.$$

Obviously, $\varphi'(x_0) = I_E$ and $\varphi(x_0) = 0$. So there exists an open disk $D_{r_0}^E(x_0) \subset E$ with center x_0 and radius r_0 such that $\varphi : D_{r_0}^E(x_0) \to \varphi(D_{r_0}^E(x_0))$ is a diffeomorphism. Let $T_0^+D_m^F(0) \subset \varphi(D_{r_0}^E(x_0))$ where $D_m^F(0) \subset F$ is an open disk with center 0 and radius m. Then ψ is defined on $D_m^F(0)$. Obviously, $\psi'(0) = I_F$ and $\psi(0) = f(x_0)$. So there exists an open disk in F, without loss of generality, still write it as $D_m^F(0)$, such that $\psi : D_m^F(0) \to \psi(D_m^F(0))$ is a diffeomorphism. Clearly, both $T_0 \circ \varphi$ and $\|f'(x) - T_0\|$ are continuous at x_0. Hence, there exists an open disk $D_{r_1}^E(x_0)$, $r_1 < r_0$, such that

$$T_0 \circ \varphi(x) \in D_m^F(0) \ \text{ and } \ \|f'(x) - T_0\| < \|T_0^+\|^{-1}, \ \ x \in D_{r_1}^E(x_0).$$

Hence, $\psi \circ T_0 \circ \varphi$ is defined on $D_{r_1}^E(x_0)$. Since x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$, we have

$$N(f'(x)) = \varphi'(x)^{-1}N(T_0), \quad \forall x \in D_{r_1}^E(x_0), \tag{1.5}$$

which is essential to the proof. Indeed,

$$\varphi'(x) = T_0^+f'(x) + (I_E - T_0^+T_0), \quad \forall x \in D_{r_0}^E(x_0)$$

and so

$$\varphi'(x)N(f'(x)) = (I_E - T_0^+T_0)N(f'(x)).$$

Then by the equivalence of (i) and (v) in Theorem 1.1,

$$N(T_0) = (I_E - T_0^+T_0)N(f'(x)) = \varphi'(x)N(f'(x)), \quad \forall x \in D_{r_1}^E(x_0),$$

i.e., the equality (1.5) holds.

Next go to show that for any disk $D_l^E(0) \subset \varphi(D_{r_1}^E(x_0))$, there exists an open disk $D_{r_2}^E(x_0), 0 < r_2 < r_1$, such that

$$T_0^+(f(x) - f(x_0)) - (1 - t)(I_E - T_0^+T_0)(x - x_0) \in D_l^E(0), \tag{1.6}$$

for all $x \in D^E_{r_2}(x_0)$ and $t \in [0,1]$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))-(1-t)(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0)\|\\ &\quad\le \|T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))\|+\|(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0)\|,\end{aligned}$$

and both $T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))$ and $(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0)$ are continuous and vanish at x_0. The conclusion (1.6) is obvious. We fix some l and write the corresponding $D^E_{r_2}(x_0)$ as $D^E_r(x_0)$. Applying (1.5) and (1.6) we will prove

$$\begin{aligned}&(f\circ\varphi^{-1})(T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))+(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0))\\ &\quad=(f\circ\varphi^{-1})(T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))),\qquad \forall x\in D^E_r(x_0).\end{aligned}\tag{1.7}$$

In view of (1.6) consider

$$\Phi(t,x)=(f\circ\varphi^{-1})(T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))-(1-t)(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0)),$$

for all $t\in[0,1]$ and $x\in D^E_r(x_0)$.

For abbreviation, write $x_*=T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))-(1-t)(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0)$. It is seen directly

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dt}=f'(\varphi^{-1}(x_*))\cdot(\varphi^{-1})'(x_*)\cdot(T_0^+T_0-I_E)(x-x_0).$$

Then by (1.5), $\dfrac{d\Phi}{dt}=0$ for all $t\in[0,1]$ and $x\in D^E_r(x_0)$. Thus $\Phi(1,x)=\Phi(0,x)$, i.e., the equality (1.7) holds. Finally go to prove the theorem. By direct computing

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi\circ T_0\circ\varphi)(x) &= \psi(T_0T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0)))\\ &= (f\circ\varphi^{-1})(T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))))+(I_F-T_0T_0^+)(T_0T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0)))\\ &= (f\circ\varphi^{-1})(T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))),\end{aligned}$$

while by (1.7).

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi\circ T_0\circ\varphi)(x) &= (f\circ\varphi^{-1})(T_0^+(f(x)-f(x_0))+(I_E-T_0^+T_0)(x-x_0))\\ &= (f\circ\varphi^{-1})(\varphi(x))=f(x),\qquad \forall x\in D^E_r(x_0).\end{aligned}$$

The theorem is proved. □

By Theorem 1.5, we further have

Theorem 1.8 (Complete Rank Theorem) *Suppose that $f:U\subset E\to F$ is a c^1 map, and $f'(x_0), x_0\in U$, is double splitting. Then f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ near x_0 if and only if x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$.*

Proof Assume that x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$, then by Theorem 1.7, f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ near x_0.

Assume that $f(x) = (\psi \circ f'(x_0) \circ \varphi)(x), \forall x \in U_0$. Let T_0^+ be arbitrary one of the generalized inverses of $T_0 = f'(x_0)$. Without loss of generality, one can assume $\|f'(x) - T_0\| < \|T_0^+\|^{-1}, \forall x \in U_0$. Set $B_x = \varphi'(x)^{-1} \cdot T_0^+ \cdot \psi'(T_0 \circ \varphi(x))^{-1}$. Since $\varphi'(x_0) = I_E$ and $\psi'(0) = I_F$ one observes $\lim_{x \to x_0} B_x = T_0^+$. By direct computing

$$f'(x) = \psi'(T_0\varphi(x))T_6\varphi'(x), \text{ and so } B_x f'(x)B_x = B_x \text{ and } f'(x)B_x f'(x) = f'(x)$$

for all $x \in U_0$. Thus by Theorem 1.5 we conclude x_0 is a locally fine point of $f'(x)$. $\square$

It is well known that if any one of the following conditions holds:

(1) $f'(x) \in F_k$ near x_0,

(2) $f'(x_0) \in \Phi_{0,n}(n \leq \infty)$,

(3)$f'(x_0) \in \Phi_{m,0}(m \leq \infty)$

then f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ near x_0 (see [Zei]). By Theorem 1.2 we have

Theorem 1.9 *Let $f'(x_0)$ belong to any one of the following classes: $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{\infty,n}$ $(n < \infty)$ and $\Phi_{m,\infty}(m < \infty)$. Then f is locally conjugate to $f'(x_0)$ near x_0, if and only if $f'(x)$ near x_0 belongs to the class corresponding to $f'(x_0)$.*

Obviously, the classes of operators indicated in Theorem 1.9 contain properly the three classes above. So, Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.8 give the complete answer to the rank theorem problem proposed by M. S. Berger in [Beg].

Besides Theorems 1.5, 1.6, 1.8 and 1.9 the concept of a locally fine point leads to expansions of the concepts of regular point, regular value, and transversility, so that it bears the generalized preimage and then the transversility theorem by R. Thom (see [Ma2] and [Ma3]). From this point of view, the concept of a locally fine point should be a nice mathematical concept.

Also, in the next sections 2 and 3, we will need the following theorems in perturbation analysis of generalized inverses.

Theorem 1.10 *Suppose that E_0 and E_1 are two closed subspaces in a Banach space E with a common complement E_*. Then there exists a unique operator $\alpha \in B(E_0, E_*)$ such that*

$$E_1 = \{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in E_0\}.$$

Conversely, $E_1 = \{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in E_0\}$ for any $\alpha \in B(E_0, E_*)$ is a closed subspace satisfying $E_1 \oplus E_* = E$.

Proof First go to show that α is unique for which $E_1 = \{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in E_0\}$. If $\{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in E_0\} = \{e + \alpha_1 e : \forall e \in E_0\}$, then for any $e \in E_0$ there exists $e_1 \in E_0$ such that $(e - e_1) + (\alpha e - \alpha_1 e_1) = 0$, and so, $e = e_1$ and $\alpha e = \alpha_1 e$, i.e., $\alpha_1 = \alpha$. This says that α is unique. We now claim that $\alpha = P_{E_*}^{E_0} P_{E_1}^{E_*}\Big|_{E_0} \in B(E_0, E_*)$ fulfils $E_1 = \{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in E_0\}$.

Obviously,

$$P_{E_0}^{E_*}P_{E_1}^{E_*}e = P_{E_0}^{E_*}(P_{E_1}^{E_*}e + P_{E_*}^{E_1}e) = P_{E_0}^{E_*}e = e, \qquad \forall e \in E_0,$$

and

$$P_{E_1}^{E_*}P_{E_0}^{E_*}e = P_{E_1}^{E_*}(P_{E_0}^{E_*}e + P_{E_*}^{E_0}e) = P_{E_1}^{E_*}e = e, \qquad \forall e \in E_1.$$

Hereby let $\alpha = P_{E_*}^{E_0}P_{E_1}^{E_*}$, then

$$e + \alpha e = P_{E_0}^{E_*}P_{E_1}^{E_*}e + P_{E_*}^{E_0}P_{E_1}^{E_*}e = P_{E_1}^{E_*}e \in E_1$$

for any $e \in E_0$; conversely,

$$e = P_{E_0}^{E_*}e + P_{E_*}^{E_0}e = P_{E_0}^{E_*}e + P_{E_*}^{E_0}P_{E_1}^{E_*}P_{E_0}^{E_*}e$$

for any $e \in E_1$. So

$$E_1 = \{e + \alpha e : \forall e \in E_0\}.$$

Conversely, assume $E_1 = \{e_0 + \alpha e_0 : \forall e_0 \in E_0\}$ for any $\alpha \in B(E_0, E_*)$. We claim that E_1 is closed. Let $e = e_0 + \alpha e_0 \to e_*$, then

$$P_{E_0}^{E_*}e = e_0 \to P_{E_0}^{E_*}e_* \in E_0, \text{and } P_{E_*}^{E_0}e = \alpha e_0 \to \alpha(P_{E_0}^{E_*}e_*)$$

since for all $\alpha, P_{E_0}^{E_*}$ and $P_{E_*}^{E_0}$ are bounded. So

$$e_* = P_{E_0}^{E_*}e_* + P_{E_*}^{E_0}e_* = P_{E_0}^{E_*}e_* + \alpha(P_{E_0}^{E_*}e_*) \in E_1.$$

This shows that E_1 is closed. Also, one observes $E_1 \cap E_* = \{0\}$, since $e_0 + \alpha e_0 \in E_*$ implies $e_0 = 0$. Obviously,

$$e = P_{E_0}^{E_*}e + P_{E_*}^{E_0}e = (P_{E_0}^{E_*}e + \alpha(P_{E_0}^{E_*}e)) + (P_{E_*}^{E_0}e - \alpha(P_{E_0}^{E_*}e)), \quad \forall e \in E,$$

which shows $E_1 \oplus E_* \supset E$. So $E_1 \oplus E_* = E$. The proof ends. □

Theorem 1.11 *Suppose that $A \in B(E, F)$ is double splitting and $A \neq 0$. Let A^+ be a generalized inverse of A. Define*

$$M(A, A^+)(T) = (T - A)A^+A + C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)T, \qquad \forall T \in V(A, A^+).$$

Then $M(A, A^+)$ is a smooth diffeomorphism from $V(A, A^+)$ onto itself with the fixed point A.

For abbreviation, write $M(A, A^+)$ as M in the sequel.

Proof Note $C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)TA^+ = AA^+$ as indicated in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}(M(T) - A)A^+ &= (T - A)A^+ + C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)TA^+ - AA^+ \\ &= (T - A)A^+\end{aligned}$$

so $C_A^{-1}(A^+, M(T)) = C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)$. In addition, $C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)$ for $T \in V(A^+, A)$ is smooth, and $C_A(A^+, A) = I_F$. Then one concludes $M(T)$ is a smooth map on $V(A, A^+)$ into itself with the fixed point A. Now we merely need to show that M has an inverse map on $V(A, A^+)$. Fortunately, we have

$$M^{-1}(m) = mA^+A + C_A(A^+, m)m(I_E - A^+A) \quad \text{for all} \quad m \in V(A, A^+).$$

In what follows, we are going to examine $(M \circ M^{-1})(m) = m$ for all $m \in V(A, A^+)$ and $(M^{-1} \circ M)(T) = T$ for all $T \in V(A, A^+)$. Evidently,

$$(M^{-1}(m) - A)A^+ = (m - A)A^+ + C_A(A^+, m)m(I_E - A^+A)A^+ = (m - A)A^+.$$

Hereby, one observes $C_A(A^+, M^{-1}(m)) = C_A(A^+, m)$ and so

$$C_A^{-1}(A^+, m) = C_A^{-1}(A^+, M^{-1}(m)) \quad \text{for any} \quad m \in V(A, A^+).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(M \circ M^{-1})(m) &= (M^{-1}(m) - A)A^+A + C_A^{-1}(A^+, M^{-1}(m))M^{-1}(m) \\
&= (m - A)A^+A + C_A^{-1}(A^+, m)(mA^+A + C_A(A^+, m)m(I_E - A^+A)) \\
&= (m - A)A^+A + m(I_E - A^+A) + A = m, \quad \forall m \in V(A, A^+); \\
(M^{-1} \circ M)(T) &= M(T)A^+A + C_A(A^+, M(T))M(T)(I_E - A^+A) \\
&= (T - A)A^+A + C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)TAA^+A + C_A(A^+, M(T))M(T)(I_E - A^+A) \\
&= TA^+A + C_A(A^+, M(T))C_A^{-1}(A^+, T)T(I_E - A^+A) \\
&= TA^+A + T(I_E - A^+A) = T, \quad \forall T \in V(A, A^+).
\end{aligned}$$

□

2 The co-final set and Frobenius Theorem

Let E be a Banach space, and Λ an open set in E. Assign a subspace $M(x)$ in E for every point x in Λ, especially, where the dimension of $M(x)$ may be infinite. In this section, we consider the family $\mathcal{F}$ consisting of all $M(x)$ over Λ. We investigate the sufficient and necessary condition for $\mathcal{F}$ being c^1 integrable at a pint x in Λ. We stress that the concept of co-final set of $\mathcal{F}$ at $x_0 \in \Lambda$ is introduced.

Definition 2.1 *Suppose $E = M(x_0) \oplus E_*$ for $x_0 \in \Lambda$. The set*

$$J(x_0, E_*) = \{x \in \Lambda : M(x) \oplus E_* = E\},$$

is called a co-final set of $\mathcal{F}$ at x_0.

The following theorem tell us the co-final set and integral submanifold of $\mathcal{F}$ at x_0 has some connection.

Theorem 2.1 *If $\mathcal{F}$ is c^1-integrable at $x_0 \in \Lambda$, say that $S \subset E$ is an integral submanifold of $\mathcal{F}$ at x_0, then there exist a closed subspace E_* and a neighborhood U_0 at x_0, such that*

$$M(x) \oplus E_* = E, \qquad \forall x \in S \cap U_0,$$

i.e.,

$$J(x_0, E_*) \supset S \cap U_0.$$

Proof Recall that the submanifold S in the Banach space E is said to be tangent to $M(x)$ at $x \in S$ provided

$$M(x) = \{\dot{c}(0) : \forall c^1-\text{curve} \subset S \text{with } c(0) = x\}. \tag{2.1}$$

By the definition of the submanifold, there exist a subspace E_0 splitting in E, say $E = E_0 \oplus E_1$, a neighborhood U_0 at x_0, and a c^1-diffeomorphism $\varphi : U_0 \to \varphi(U_0)$ such that $\varphi(S \cap U_0)$ is an open set in E_0. We claim

$$\varphi'(x)M(x) = E_0, \qquad \forall x \in S \cap U_0. \tag{2.2}$$

Let $c(t)$ with $c(0) = x$ be an arbitrary c^1-curve contained in $S \cap U_0$, then $\varphi'(x)\dot{c}(0) \in E_0$, and so $\varphi'(x)M(x) \subset E_0$. Conversely, let $r(t) = \varphi(x) + te \subset \varphi(S \cap U_0)$ for any $e \in E_0$, and set $c(t) = \varphi^{-1}(r(t)) \subset S \cap U_0$, then $\varphi'(x)\dot{c}(0) = e$ and so $\varphi'(x)M(x) \supset E_0$. We now conclude that (2.2) holds. For abbreviation in the sequel, write $M_0 = M(x_0)$. Let $E_x = \varphi'(x)^{-1}E_1$ and $E_* = E_{x_0}$ We claim $M(x) \oplus E_* = E, \forall x \in S \cap U_0$. Evidently, $\varphi'(x_0)(M_0 \oplus E_*) = E_0 \oplus E_1 = E$ by (2.2), and so, $M_0 \oplus E_* = E$. Consider the projection

$$P_x = \varphi'(x)^{-1}\varphi'(x_0)P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi'(x_0)^{-1}\varphi'(x), \qquad \forall x \in S \cap U_0. \tag{2.3}$$

Obviously, $P_x^2 = P_x$, i.e., P_x is a projection on E. Next go to show $R(P_x) = M(x)$ and $N(P_x) = E_x$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} e \in N(P_x) &\Leftrightarrow \varphi'(x_0)^{-1}\varphi'(x)e \in E_* \Leftrightarrow \varphi'(x)e \in E_1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow e \in \varphi'(x)^{-1}E_1 = E_x; \\ R(P_x) &= \varphi'(x)^{-1}\varphi'(x_0)M_0 = \varphi'(x)^{-1}E_0 = M(x). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, P_x is a generalized inverse of itself, and $\lim\limits_{x \to x_0} P_x = P_{M_0}^{E_*}$.

Recall in the proof of the sufficiency of Theorem 1.5 the following conclusion is proved at first: for some generalized inverse T_0^+ of T_0, T_x near x_0 has a generalized inverse T_x^+ and $\lim\limits_{x \to x_0} T_x^+ = T_0^+$, then there exists a neighborhood V_0 at x_0 such that $R(T_x) \cap N(T_0^+) = \{0\}$ for all $x \in V_0$. We mention that this conclusion is very useful in the modern perturbation analysis of generalized inverses.

Now, take $S \cap U_0, P_x, P_{M_0}^{E_*}$ and $P_{M_0}^{E_*}$ in place of X, T_x, T_0 and T_0^+ in the conclusion, respectively. Then we have $R(P_x) \cap N(P_{M_0}^{E_*}) = \{0\}$ for all $x \in V_0$. Without loss of

generality, one can assume $V_0 \subset \{x \in S \cap U_0 : \|P_x - P_{M_0}^{E_*}\| < \|P_{M_0}^{E_*}\|^{-1}\}$ and $V_0 = S \cap U_0$. Thus, by the equivalence of the conditions (i) and (iii) in Theorem 1.1 we conclude

$$R(P_x) \oplus N(P_{M_0}^{E_*}) = E, \text{ i.e., } M(x) \oplus E_* = E, \ \forall x \in S \cap U_0.$$

This shows $J(x_0, E_*) \supset S \cap U_0$. $\square$

Using M_0 and E_* in place of E_0 and E_1 in Theorem 2.1 respectively, we have

Lemma 2.1 *With the same assumption and notations, E_*, E_0 and U_0 as in Theorem 2.1, the following conclusion holds: there exists a c^1 diffeomorphism $\varphi : U_0 \to \varphi(U_0)$ with $\varphi(x_0) = 0$ such that $V_0 = \varphi(S \cap U_0)$ is an open set in M_0, and*

$$\varphi'(x)M(x) = M_0, \qquad \forall x \in S \cap U_0. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof Consider the c^1-diffeomorphism φ in the proof of Theorem 2.1 and no loss of generality, we may assume $\varphi(x_0) = 0$, since otherwise we may take $\varphi - \varphi(x_0)$ in place of φ. Also, $\varphi'(x)M(x) = E_0$ for all $x \in S \cap U_0$, specially, $\varphi'(x_0)M_0 = E_0$. Again instead of φ by $\varphi'(x_0)^{-1}\varphi$, still write it as φ, the lemma follows. $\square$

By Theorem 2.1, $J(x_0, E_*) \supset S \cap U_0$ when $\mathcal{F}$ is integrable at x_0. Due to the co-final set $J(x_0, E_*)$, we get the applicable equation of the integral submanifold under the coordinate system $(M_0, 0, E_*)$ as shown in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ is c^1-integrable at x_0. With the same notations, S, U_0, V_0 and φ as in Lemma 2.1, the following conclusion holds: there exists a neighborhood V_* at 0 in V_0, such that $P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1} : V_* \to P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1}(V_*)$ is a c^1 diffeomorphism in M_0, and*

$$\varphi^{-1}(V_*) = (I_E + \psi)(V), \tag{2.5}$$

where $V = P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1}(V_*)$ and $\psi = (P_{E_*}^{M_0}\varphi^{-1}) \circ (P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1}|_{V_*})^{-1}$.

Proof By Lemma 2.1, there are a neighborhood U_0 at x_0 and c^1 diffeomorphism φ from U_0 onto $\varphi(U_0)$ with $\varphi(x_0) = 0$, such that $V_0 = \varphi(S \cap U_0)$ is an open set in M_0. Consider the c^1 map $\varphi_1 = p_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1} : V_0 \to M_0$. In order to seek V_* in (2.5), we are going to show that $\varphi_1'(0)$ is invertible in $B(M_0)$. According to (2.4) we have $M_0 = \varphi'(x_0)^{-1}M_0 = (\varphi^{-1})'(0)M_0$, so that $\varphi_1'(0)M_0 = P_{M_0}^{E_*}(\varphi^{-1})'(0)M_0 = M_0$; while

$$\varphi_1'(0)e = P_{M_0}^{E_*}(\varphi^{-1})'(0)e = (\varphi^{-1})'(0)e \quad \text{for any} \quad e \in M_0,$$

and so $N(\varphi_1'(0)) = \{0\}$ because of φ being a c^1 diffeomorphism. Hence $\varphi_1'(0)$ is invertible in $B(M_0)$. Thus by the inverse map theorem, there exists a neighborhood V_* at 0 in V_0 such that $\varphi_1 : V_* \to \varphi_1(V_*)$ is a c^1 diffeomorphism. Let $V = \varphi_1(V_*)$ and $\psi = \varphi_2 \circ \varphi_1^{-1}$ where $\varphi_2 = P_{E_*}^{M_0}\varphi^{-1}$. Then

$$\varphi^{-1}(V_*) = \varphi_1(V_*) + \varphi_2(V_*) = (I_E + \psi)(V).$$

The proof ends. $\square$

According to Theorem 1.10, for $x \in J(x_0, E_*)$ $M(x)$ has the coordinate expression

$$M(x) = \{e + \alpha(x)e : \forall e \in M_0\}$$

where $\alpha \in B(M_0, E_*)$.

We now state the Frobenius theorem in a Banach space.

Theorem 2.2 (Frobenius theorem) *$\mathcal{F}$ is c^1 integrable at x_0 if and only if the following conditions hold:*

(i) *M_0 splits in E, say $E = M_0 \oplus E_*$;*

(ii) *there exists a neighborhood V at$P_{M_0}^{E_*}x_0$ in M_0, and a c^1 map $\psi : V \to E_*$, such that $x + \psi(x) \in J(x_0, E_*)$ for all $x \in V$, and α is continuous in V;*

(iii) ψ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi'(x) = \alpha(x + \psi(x)) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in V, \\ &\psi(P_{M_0}^{E_*}x_0) = P_{E_*}^{M_0}x_0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where $\psi'(x)$is Fréchet derivative of ψ at x.

Proof Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is c^1-integrable at x_0. Go to prove that the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in the theorem hold. By Theorem 2.1, the condition (i) holds, and $J(x_0, E_*) \supset S \cap U_0$. By Lemma 2.2, there is a neighborhood V_* at 0 in $V_0 = \varphi(S \cap U_0)$ such that

$$J(x_0, E_*) \supset S \cap U_0 \supset \varphi^{-1}(V_*) = \{x + \psi(x) : \forall x \in V\},$$

where

$$V = P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1}(V_*) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = (P_{E_*}^{M_0}\varphi^{-1}) \circ (P_{M_0}^{E_*}\varphi^{-1}|_{V_*})^{-1}.$$

Obviously, the equation (2.6) implies that $\alpha(x + \psi(x))$ is continuous in V. Next we merely need to prove that the equation (2.6) holds. First we claim

$$M(x + \psi(x)) = (I_E + \psi'(x))M_0 \qquad \forall x \in V. \tag{2.7}$$

By (2.5),

$$d(t) = (I_E + \psi)(c(t)) \quad \text{for any} \quad c^1\text{−curve } c(t) \subset V \text{ with } c(0) = x$$

is a c^1-curve$\subset \varphi^{-1}(V_*)$ with $d(0) = x + \psi(x)$. While, since $V_* \subset V_0$, $\varphi^{-1}(V_*)$ is the c^1 integral submanifold of $\mathcal{F}$ at $x + \psi(x)$, and so, $M(x + \psi(x))$ is tangent to $\varphi^{-1}(V_*)$ at $x + \psi(x)$. Then, one can conclude $M(x + \psi(x)) \supset (I_E + \psi')(x)M_0$ for any $x \in V$. Conversely, let

$$c(t) = P_{M_0}^{E_*}d(t) \quad \text{for any} \quad c^1\text{−curve } d(t) \subset \varphi^{-1}(V_*) \text{ with } d(0) = x + \psi(x),$$

then it follows that $c(t)$ is a c^1-curve$\subset V$ with $c(0) = x$ since

$$c(t) = P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(d(t))), \quad \varphi(d(t)) \subset V_*, \quad \text{and} \quad V = P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}(V_*).$$

Note

$$\psi = (P^{M_0}_{E_*}\varphi^{-1}) \circ (P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}|_{V_*})^{-1}.$$

Evidently

$$\begin{aligned}(I_E + \psi)(c(t)) &= P^{E_*}_{M_0}d(t) + \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}d(t)) \\ &= P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(d(t))) + \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(d(t))) \\ &= P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(d(t)) + P^{M_0}_{E_*}\varphi^{-1}(d(t))) \\ &= P^{E_*}_{M_0}d(t) + P^{M_0}_{E_*}d(t) = d(t).\end{aligned}$$

So (2.7) holds.

In what follows, we go to verify (2.6). Due to the co-final set $J(x_0, E_*) \supset \{x+\psi(x) : \forall x \in V\}$ as pointed at the beginning of the proof and Theorem 1.10, we have

$$M(x + \psi(x)) = \{e + \alpha(x + \psi(x))e : \forall e \in M_0\},$$

where $\alpha(x + \psi(x)) \in B(M_0, E_*)$. Thus, it follows from the equality (2.7) that for any $e \in M_0$, there exists $e_0 \in M_0$ such that

$$e + \alpha(x + \psi(x))e = e_0 + \psi'(x)e_0.$$

Hence $e = e_0$, so that

$$\alpha(x + \psi(x))e = \psi'(x)e \quad \text{for all} \quad e \in M_0,$$

i.e.,

$$\alpha(x + \psi(x)) = \psi'(x), \qquad \forall x \in V.$$

Obviously,

$$\psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x_0) = \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}\varphi^{-1}(0)) = P^{M_0}_{E_*}(0)x_0.$$

Now, the necessity of the theorem is proved.

Assume that the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold. Go to show that $\mathcal{F}$ is c^1 integrable at x_0. Let $S = \{x + \psi(x) : \forall x \in V\}$,

$$V^* = \{x \in E : P^{E_*}_{M_0}x \in V\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(x) = x + \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x), \forall x \in V^*.$$

Obviously, V^* is an open set in E, $\Phi(V) = S$, and Φ is a c^1 map. Moreover, we are going to prove that $\Phi : V^* \to \Phi(V^*)$ is a diffeomorphism. Evidently, if $\Phi(x_1) = \Phi(x_2)$, for $x_1, x_2 \in V^*$, i.e.,

$$P^{E_*}_{M_0}(x_1 - x_2) + \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x_1) - \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x_2) + P^{M_0}_{E_*}(x_1 - x_2) = 0$$

then $P^{E_*}_{M_0}x_1 = P^{E_*}_{M_0}x_2$, and so $P^{M_0}_{E_*}x_1 = P^{M_0}_{E_*}x_2$. This shows that $\Phi : V^* \to \Phi(V^*)$ is one-to-one. Now, in order to show that $\Phi : V^* \to \Phi(V^*)$ is a c^1 diffeomorphism, we need only to show that $\Phi(V^*)$ is an open set in E. By the inverse map theorem it is enough to examine that $\Phi'(x)$ for any $x \in V^*$ is invertible in $B(E)$. According to the condition (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'(x) &= I_E + \psi'(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x)P^{E_*}_{M_0} \\ &= P^{E_*}_{M_0} + \alpha(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x + \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x))P^{E_*}_{M_0} + P^{M_0}_{E_*} \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

for any $x \in V^*$. If $\Phi'(x)e = 0$, i.e., $P^{E_*}_{M_0}e + \psi'(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x)P^{E_*}_{M_0}e + P^{M_0}_{E_*}e = 0$, then $P^{E_*}_{M_0}e = 0$ and so, $P^{M_0}_{E_*}e = 0$. This says $N(\Phi'(x)) = \{0\}$ for any $x \in V^*$. Next go to verify that $\Phi'(x)$ is surjective.

For abbreviation, write $M(y) = M_*$ and $y = P^{E_*}_{M_0}x + \psi(P^{E_*}_{M_0}x)$ for any $x \in V^*$. Obviously, $y \in S$ and by the assumption (ii), $y \in J(x_0, E_*)$, i.e., $M_* \oplus E_* = E$. Hence the following conclusion holds: there exists $e_0 \in M_0$ such that $P^{E_*}_{M_*}e = e_0 + \alpha(y)e_0$ for any $e \in E$. Set $e_* = e_0 + P^{M_*}_{E_*}e$, then by (2.8),

$$\Phi'(x)e_* = e_0 + \alpha(y)e_0 + P^{M_*}_{E_*}e = P^{E_*}_{M_*}e + P^{M_*}_{E_*}e = e.$$

This says that $\Phi'(x)$ for any $x \in V^*$ is surjective. Thus we have proved that Φ^{-1} is a c^1-diffeomorphism from open set $\Phi(V^*)$ onto V^* and $\Phi^{-1}(S) = V$ is an open set in M_0. i.e., S is a c^1 submanifold of E. Finally go to show that S is tangent to $M(x)$ at any point $x \in S$.

Write

$$T(x + \psi(x)) = \{\dot{c}(0) : \forall c^1\text{-curve}c(t) \subset S \text{ with } c(0) = x + \psi(x)\}$$

for any $x \in V$.

Repeat the process of the proof of the equality (2.2) in Theorem 2.1, one can conclude

$$(\Phi^{-1})'(x + \psi(x))T(x + \psi(x)) = M_0, \quad \text{i. e.,} \quad \Phi'(x)M_0 = T(x + \psi(x))$$

for any $x \in V$. By (2.8),

$$\Phi'(x + \psi(x))e = e + \alpha(x + \psi(x))e, \qquad \forall e \in M_0.$$

So

$$T(x + \psi(x)) = \Phi'(x)M_0 = M(x + \psi(x)), \qquad \forall x \in V,$$

which shows that S is tangent to $M(x)$ at any $x \in S$. The proof ends. □

The co-final set $J(x_0, E_*)$ is essential to Frobenius theorem in Banach space. When $J(x_0, E_*)$ is trivial, which means that x_0 is an inner point of $J(x_0, E_*)$, the theorem

reduces to the initial value problem (2.6). The following example will illustrate this fact, although it is very simple.

Example *Let* $E = \mathbf{R}^2, \Lambda = \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus (0,0)$ *and*

$$M(x,y) = \{(X,Y) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : Xx + Yy = 0\}, \qquad \forall (x,y) \in \Lambda.$$

Consider the family of subspaces, $\mathcal{F} = \{M(x,y) : \forall (x,y) \in \Lambda\}$. *Applying Frobenius theorem in Banach space to determine the integral curve of* $\mathcal{F}$ *at* $(0,1)$.

Set $U_0 = \{(x,y) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : y > 0\}$ and $E_* = \{(0,y) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : \forall y \in R\}$. Obviously, $U_0 \subset \Lambda$, and

$$M(x,y) \oplus E_* = \mathbf{R}^2, \qquad \forall (x,y) \in U_0,$$

since

$$M(x,y) \cap E_* = (0,0), \qquad \forall (x,y) \in U_0.$$

Hence $J((0,1), E_*) \supset U_0$. This shows that $J((0,1), E_*)$ is trivial.

Next go to determine α in the equation (2.6). Note $M_0 = M(0,1) = \{(X,0) : \forall X \in R\}$. Evidently,

$$\begin{aligned} M(x,y) &= \{(X, -\frac{x}{y}X) : \forall X \in R\} \\ &= \{(X,0) + (0 - \frac{x}{y}X) : \forall X \in R\} \end{aligned}$$

for all $(x,y) \in U_0$. By Theorem 1.10 we can conclude

$$\alpha(x,y)(X,0) = (0, -\frac{x}{y}X), \qquad \forall (x,y) \in U_0.$$

Moreover, we claim that $\alpha : U_0 \to B(M_0, E_*)$ is continuous in U_0. Obviously

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\alpha(x + \Delta x, y + \Delta y) - \alpha(x,y))(X,0)\| \\ &\quad = \left\| (0, (\frac{x}{y} - \frac{x + \Delta x}{y + \Delta y})X) \right\| = \left| \frac{x + \Delta x}{y + \Delta y} - \frac{x}{y} \right| \|(X,0)\| \end{aligned}$$

for any $(x,y) \in U_0$, where $\|,\|$ denotes the norm in $\mathbf{R}^2$.

So

$$\|\alpha(x + \Delta x, y + \Delta y) - \alpha(x,y)\| = \left| \frac{x + \Delta x}{y + \Delta y} - \frac{x}{y} \right|,$$

where $\|,\|$ denotes the norm in $B(M_0, E_*)$. Hereby, one can conclude that $\alpha : U_0 \to B(M_0, E_*)$ is continuous in U_0. Let $V = \{(x,0) : |x| < 1\} \subset M((0,1))$ and $\psi((x,0)) = (0, y(x)) \subset E_*$ for any $(x,0) \in V$, where $y(x) : (-1,1) \mapsto \mathbf{R}$ is a c^1 function. Then by the equation (2.6).

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{dy}{dx} = -\frac{x}{y}, \qquad \forall x \in (-1,1), \\ &y(0) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the solution is $y = \sqrt{1-x^2}$ for all $x \in (-1,1)$. So, $S = \{(x, \sqrt{1-x^2}) : x \in (-1,1)\}$ is the smooth integral curve of $\mathcal{F} = \{M(x,y) : (x,y) \in \Lambda\}$ at $(0,1)$. (See [Ma4] also.)

When the co-final set $J(x_0, E_*)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ at x_0 is non trivial, it is a key point to Frobenius theorem to seek $J(x_0, E_*)$. In the next section, we will consider such a family of subspaces, which appears in the investigation of geometrical method for some partial differential equations (see [Caf]).

3 A Family of Subspaces with Non-trivial Co-Final Set and Its Smooth Integral Submanifolds

Let $\Lambda = B(E,F) \setminus \{0\}$ and $M(X) = \{T \in B(E,F) : TN(X) \subset R(X)\}$ for $X \in \Lambda$. V. Cafagna introduced the geometrical method for some partial differential equations and presented the family of subspaces $\mathcal{F} = \{M(X)\}_{X \in \Lambda}$ in [Caf]. Now we take the following example to illustrate that when A is neither left nor right invertible in $B(R^2)$, the co-final set of $\mathcal{F}$ at A is non-trivial.

Example *Let $\Lambda = B(R^2) \setminus \{0\}$, the matrix $A = \{a_{i,j}\}_{i,j=1}^2$ and the subspace $\mathbb{E}_*$ in $B(R^2)$ be as follows*

$$a_{i,j} = 0 \quad \text{except} \quad a_{1,1} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \{T = \{t_{i,j}\} \in B(R^2) : t_{i,j} = 0 \quad \text{except} \quad t_{2,2}\},$$

respectively. To verify that $J(A, \mathbb{E}_*)$ is non-trivial. Evidently, $N(A) = \{(0,y) : \forall y \in R\}$ and $R(A) = \{(x,0) : \forall x \in R\}$. So

$$M(A) = \{T = \{t_{i,j}\} \in B(R^2) : t_{2,2} = 0\}$$

and

$$M(A) \oplus \mathbb{E}_* = B(\mathbf{R}^2).$$

However, there is an invertible matrix $A_\varepsilon = \{a_{i,j}\}$ with $a_{1,1} = 1, a_{1,2} = a_{2,1} = 0$, and $a_{2,2} = \varepsilon$, such that $M(A_\varepsilon) = B(R^2)$ for any $\varepsilon \neq 0$. This says that $J(A, \mathbf{E}_*)$ is non-trivial since $dim M(A) = 3, dim M(A_\varepsilon) = 4$, and $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} A_\varepsilon = A$.

In this case, for seeking integral submanifold of $\mathcal{F}$ at A, we try the co-final set $J(A, \mathbb{E}_*)$ according to Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that $X \in \Lambda$ is double splitting, say that X^+ is a generalized inverse of X. Then*

$$M(X) = \left\{ P_{R(X)}^{N(X^+)} T + R_{N(X^+)}^{R(X)} T P_{R(X^+)}^{N(X)} : \forall T \in B(E,F) \right\}, \tag{3.1}$$

and one of its complements is

$$\mathbb{E}_X = \left\{ P^{R(X)}_{N(X^+)} T P^{R(X^+)}_{N(X)} : \forall T \in B(E,F) \right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof Obviously

$$T = P^{N(X^+)}_{R(X)} T + P^{R(X)}_{N(X^+)} T P^{N(X)}_{R(X^+)} + P^{R(X)}_{N(X^+)} T P^{R(X^+)}_{N(X)}. \tag{3.3}$$

So the equality (3.1) follows from the definition of $M(X)$ and (3.3). □

As a corollary of the lemma we have

Corollary 3.1 *With the assumption and notations as in Lemma 3.1 we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_X = \left\{ T \in B(E,F) : R(T) \subset N(X^+) \quad \text{and} \quad N(T) \subset R(X^+) \right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

This is immediate from (3.1) and (3.2).

Let $\mathbb{E}_* = \{T \in B(E,F) : R(T) \subset N(A^+) \text{ and } N(T) \subset R(A^+)\}$. By Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.1, $M(A) \oplus \mathbb{E}_* = B(E,F)$. Next, we go to determine the integral submanifold of $\mathcal{F}$ at A. Let

$$S = \{X \in V(A, A^+) : R(X) \cap N(A^+) = \{0\}\}.$$

Since the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 1.1 are equivalent each other, S is the set of all double splitting operators $X \in V(A, A^+)$ with $R(X^+) = R(A^+)$ and $N(X^+) = N(A^+)$. Then by Corollary 3.1, $\mathbb{E}_X = \mathbb{E}_*$ for any $X \in S$. Therefore

$$J(A, \mathbb{E}_*) \supset S = \{T \in V(A, A^+) : R(T^+) = R(A^+) \text{ and } N(T^+) = N(A^+)\}.$$

Let $X \in \Lambda$ be double splitting. Consider the smooth diffeomorphism from $V(X, X^+)$ onto itself with the fixed point X,

$$M(X, X^+)(T) = (T - X)X^+X + C_X^{-1}(X^+, T)T$$

as defined in Theorem 1.11.

By direct computing,

$$\begin{aligned} &M(X, X^+)'(T)\Delta T \\ &\quad = \Delta T X^+ X + C_X^{-1}(X^+, T)\Delta T - C_X^{-1}(X^+, T)\Delta T X^+ C_X^{-1}(X^+, T)T \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

for any $T \in V(X, X^+)$, where $M(X, X^+)'(T)$ denotes the Fréchet derivative of $M(X, X^+)(T)$ at T. Moreover, we have

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that $A \in \Lambda$ is double splitting. Then S is a smooth submanifold in $B(E,F)$ and tangent to $M(X)$ at any $X \in S$.*

Proof First we show that S is a smooth submanifold in $B(E,F)$. By Theorem 1.11, $M(A,A^+)(T)$ is a smooth diffeomorphism from $V(A,A^+)$ onto itself with the fixed point A, and hence we merely claim

$$M(A,A^+)(S) = M(A) \cap V(A,A^+). \tag{3.6}$$

Evidently,

$$M(A,A^+)(T)N(A) = C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)TN(A) \subset R(A)$$

because of the equivalence of the conditions (v) and (i) in Theorem 1.1. This shows $M(A,A^+)(S) \subset M(A) \cap V(A,A^+)$. Conversely, go to verify

$$m = M(A,A^+)^{-1}(T) \in S \quad \forall T \in M(A) \cap V(A,A^+).$$

Note the equality shown in the proof of Theorem 1.1, $C_A^{-1}(A^+,T) = C_A^{-1}(A^+,m)$. Let $m = M(A,A^+)^{-1}(T)$, for any $T \in M(A) \cap V(A,A^+)$. Then

$$C_A^{-1}(A^+,T) = C_A^{-1}(A^+, M(A,A^+)(m)) = C_A^{-1}(A^+,m).$$

Hereby,

$$\begin{aligned} C_A^{-1}(A^+,m)mN(A) &= C_A^{-1}(A^+,T)M(A,A^+)^{-1}(T)N(A) \\ &= TN(A) \subset R(A), \end{aligned}$$

so that $m \in S$ because of the equivalence of (v) and (i) in Theorem 1.1. This says that S is a smooth submanifold in $B(E,F)$. Finally go to show that S is tangent to $M(X)$ at any $X \in S$. Clearly, $C_X(X^+,X) = I_F$ and so, $C_X^{-1}(X^+,X) = I_F$. Hereby

$$M(X,X^+)'(X)\Delta T = \Delta T, \qquad \forall \Delta T \in B(E,F) \tag{3.7}$$

according to (3.5). First, we claim that S is tangent to $M(A)$ at A. From (3.6) and (3.7) it follows that $M(A,A^+)'(A)\dot{c}(0) = \dot{c}(0) \in M(A)$ for any c^1-curve $c(t) \subset S$ with $c(0) = A$. This shows that the set of all tangent vectors of S is contained in $M(A)$. Conversely, let $c(t) = M(A,A^+)^{-1}(d(t))$ for any c^1-curve $d(t) \subset M(A) \cap V(A,A^+)$ with $d(0) = A$. By (3.6), $c(t) \subset S$ and $c(0) = A$. While $d(t) = M(A,A^+)(c(t))$ and so, $\dot{d}(0) = M(A,A^+)'(A)\dot{c}(0) = \dot{c}(0)$. This shows that $M(A)$ is contained in the set of all tangent vectors of S. Now it is proved that S is tangent to $M(A)$ at A. Next turn to the proof of the conclusion for any $X \in S$. As shown in the above, X in S has the the generalized inverse $X^\oplus$ with $R(X^\oplus) = R(A^+)$ and $N(X^\oplus) = N(A^+)$. So we can consider $S_1 = \{T \in V(X,X^\oplus) : R(T) \cap N(X^\oplus) = \{0\}\}$ for X in S. For simplicity, we still write $X^\oplus$ as X^+. Clearly,

$$S \cap V(X,X^+) = S_1 \cap V(A,A^+) = S_1 \cap S \text{ and } X \in S \cap S_1.$$

In the same way as the proof of (3.6) we have

$$M(X,X^+)(S \cap S_1) = M(X) \cap V(A,A^+) \cap V(X,X^+). \tag{3.8}$$

Repeat the process of the proof of S being tangent to $M(A)$ at A. Let $c(t)$ be any c^1 curve$\subset S \cap S_1$ with $c(0) = X$. Then it follows from (3.8) and (3.7) that

$$M(X, X^+)'(X)\dot{c}(0) = \dot{c}(0) \quad \text{so that} \quad \dot{c}(0) \in M(X).$$

Conversely, let $d(t)$ be any c^1-curve$\subset M(X) \cap V(A, A^+) \cap V(X, X^+)$ with $d(0) = X$ and $c(t) = M(X, X^+)^{-1}(d(t))$. Then $d(t) = M(X, X^+)(c(t))$. By (3.7),

$$\dot{d}(0) = M(X, X^+)'(X)\dot{c}(0) = \dot{c}(0).$$

Combining the two results above one concludes that S is tangent to $M(X)$ at X. □

Theorem 3.2 *Each of $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}$ and $\Phi_{\infty,n}$ is a smooth submanifold in $B(E, F)$ and tangent to $M(X)$ at any X in it.*

Proof It is well known that $X \in F_k \cup \Phi_{m,n} \cup \Phi_{m,\infty} \cup \Phi_{\infty,n}$ is double splitting. By Theorem 3.1, $S = \{T \in V(X, X^+) : R(T) \cap N(X^+) = \{0\}\}$ is a smooth submanifold in $B(E, F)$ tangent to $M(T)$ at any $T \in S$, and $M(X, X^+)(S) = M(X) \cap V(X, X^+)$. Write Φ as any one of $F_k, \Phi_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,\infty}$ and $\Phi_{\infty,n}$. By Theorem 1.2 and (3.6),

$$S = \{T \in V(X, X^+) : R(T) \cap N(X^+) = \{0\}\}\} = \Phi \cap V(X, X^+)$$

and

$$M(X, X^+)(S) = M(X, X^+)(\Phi \cap V(X, X^+)) = M(X) \cap V(X, X^+). \tag{3.9}$$

Obviously, $(M(X, X^+), V(X, X^+), B(E, F))$ is a smooth admissible chart of $B(E, F)$ at $X \in \Phi$. While $M(X, X^+)(\Phi \cap V(X, X^+)) = M(X) \cap V(X, X^+)$ is an open set in $M(X)$ because of (3.9) and $M(X) \oplus \mathbb{E}_X = B(E, F)$ by Lemma 3.1. So we conclude that Φ is a smooth submanifold in $B(E, F)$. Finally, by Theorem 3.1,Φ is tangent to $M(X)$ at any $X \in \Phi$. The theorem is proved. □

Theorem 3.2 expands the result for $\Phi_{1,1}$ to wider classes of operators. It seems to be nice to further developing of the method by V. Cafagna in [Caf].(see [An]).

References

[Abr] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratin, Manifolds, tensor analysis and applications, 2nd ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences 75, Springer, New York, 1988.

[An] V. I. Arnol'd, Geometrical methods in the theory of ordinary differential equations, 2nd ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 250, Springer, New York, 1988.

[Beg] M. S. Berger, Non-linearity and functional analysis, A cademic Press, New York, 1977.

[Caf] V. Cafagra, Global invertibility and finite solvability", pp. 1-30 in Nonlinear functional analysis (Nework, NJ, 1987), edited by P. S. Milojevic, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. 121, Dekker, New York, 1990.

[H-M] Qianglian Huang, Jipu Ma, Perturbation analysis of generalized inverses of linear operators in Banach spaces, Linear Algebra and its Appl., 389(2004), 359-364.

[Ka] Kato, T., Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1982.

[Ma1] Jipu Ma, (1,2) inverses of operators between Banach spaces and local conjugacy theorem, Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B. 20:1(1999), 57-62.

[Ma2] Jipu Ma, A generalized preimage theorem in global analysis, Sci, China Ser. A 44:33(2001), 299-303.

[Ma3] Jipu Ma, A generalized transversility in global analysis, Pacif. J. Math., 236:2(2008), 357-371.

[Ma4] Jipu Ma, A geometry characteristic of Banach spaces with C^1-norm, Front. Math. China, 2014, 9(5): 1089-1103.

[N-C] M. Z. Nashed, X. Chen, Convergence of Newton-like methods for singular equations using outer inverses, Numer Math., 66:(1993), 235-257.

[P] R. Penrose, A generalized inverse for Matrices, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 1955, 51:406-413.

[Zei] E. Zeidler, Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications, IV: Applications to mathematical physics, Springer, New York, 1988.

1. Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing, 210093, P. R. China

2. Tseng, Yuanrong Functional Research Center, Harbin Normal University, Harbin, 150080, P. R. China

E-mail address: jipuma@126.com